

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,319 to Might (hereinafter "Might").

Might discloses a method of gathering and evaluating information which uses five highly coupled databases and software for gathering user input (respondent software), for evaluating input (evaluator software), and for administering the system (administrative software). (See Might Abstract and FIG. 1.) The first database includes the categories of users for an organization. The second database stores information about each user. The third database includes all topics and issues of interest and queries for each combination of topic, issue, and respondent category. The fourth database is the repository for the responses from users and appropriate statistics based on the responses. The fifth database includes authorization data and rules that determine how the process and system are implemented for a particular organization.

Claim 1 is directed to an information-gathering method employed in an information-gathering system for holding dialogues with customers based on dialogue scenarios. The information-gathering method of claim 1 includes storing dialogue scenarios, assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses, extracting from the dialogue scenarios a dialogue scenario to be performed, holding a dialogue with a customer following the dialogue scenario, acquiring dialogue content from the dialogue, transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario, storing the dialogue content received at the destination addresses, and outputting the dialogue content at the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Might at least because Might does not disclose "assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses." Since this correspondence between stored dialogue scenarios and destination addresses is not taught or suggested by Might, Might's teachings also do not anticipate other operations recited in claim 1. Specifically, Might does not disclose "transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario" because the destination addresses do not correspond to dialogue scenarios in Might. Further, Might does not anticipate "storing the dialogue content received at the destination addresses" and "outputting the dialogue content at the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario" since Might does not teach or

suggest that destination addresses correspond to dialogue scenarios.

Similarly, in the case of independent claim 2 which is directed to an information-gathering device for holding dialogues with customers based on dialogue scenarios, Might does not disclose at least “a scenario storage unit storing and **assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses**” (emphasis added). Additionally, since no correspondences between scenarios and destination addresses are established in Might, Might does not disclose also “an information transmission unit transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario.” Therefore, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Might.

Dependent claims 3-8 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from claim 2 from which they depend.

Independent claim 9, which is directed to a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded an information-gathering program utilized in an information-gathering device for holding dialogues with customers based on dialogue scenarios, is also patentable at least by reciting “**assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses**” and “**transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario.**”

Independent claim 10, which is directed to an information-gathering computer program product enabling a computer to hold dialogues with customers based on dialogue scenarios, patentably distinguishes over Might at least by reciting “a scenario storage unit **assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses**” (emphasis added) and “an information transmission unit transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario.”

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are rejected as unpatentable over Might in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0032115 to Goldstein (“Goldstein”).

Goldstein does not correct or compensate the above-identified failure of Might in teaching all the features of the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan. 25, 2007

By: L.Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501